G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

190
(Sep Rev)

File No. 14 of 1902-03

Serial Nos. 1-8

Papers Filed.

Month

SUBJECT.

Appeal petition of Patel Sanna Veeranna of Parsurampura village, Chellakere Taluk, against the Dy Commrs order directing that as the petitioner as surety to Bheemaiah, Toreke Shop keeper, he should pay the arrear viz Rs 511-4-0, etc rejected

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

LATER REFERENCES.

Sep. Rev. 2 no 19 of 03-04

S. R. 1[illegible] of 1902-03

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,

(REVENUE AND GENERAL DEPARTMENTS).

~~E. [illegible] of 1903-04~~

(276)

(Full Office Note.)

Subject. Letter no. 99 dated 21st Dec 02 from the Dy Comr, Chitaldrug dtd reporting on the petition of Patel Sama Veerama of Parasurampura in the matter of his purchasing to Bheemiah, toddy licensee of Parasurampura & 2 other toddy shops of Chellakere Taluk for 1902-02.

Note.

One Bheemiah was the licensee of Parasurampura & 2 other toddy shops of the Chellakere Taluk for the year 1901-02 and Patel Sama Veera[illegible] became his security under the circumstances reported in para 3 of the letter under disposal, for an amount equal to 4 months' rental i.e Rs 844/- in lieu of security deposit, which should be taken in adjustment of the rental for the last 4 months of the year (Amildar's report no 260 dated 18th December 1901).

On the 26th May 1902

‡ 1. No. and date of latest letter or paper.
2. Catch words to show nature of subject.
3. Subject to be in red and body of note in black ink.

* 1. Statement of case in narrative form in regular sequence of subject matter or date.
2. Opinions to be stated only as supported by precedents, or general rules which should always be quoted.
3. Serial numbers in file, &c., to be always stated.
4. Dates of important documents referred should be given.
5. Write on both sides, leaving the same side as margin.

(Rs 523) the Amildar reported that only a sum of Rs 332-12-0 was recovered from the licensee for the period of 14 months referred to above and solicited orders for recovering the balance of Rs 511-4-0 from the Surety as there was no means of recovering it from the licensee. This was approved by the Dy Commr in his order no. 807 dt 28/5/02.

In the meanwhile Sawai Veeranna petitioned the Amildar on 10/3/02 to relieve him of his liability as surety as the licensee did not satisfy the Condition on which he accepted it. The Dy Commr whose orders were solicited in the matter directed, that the prayer cannot be granted and that the arrears should be recovered from him (Surety) alone, having recourse to coercive measures if necessary, which was communicated to the petitioner by the Amildar

Order no 634 dt 27.3.02

in No 566 dated 25/6/02.
It is against this order that
the petitioner appealed to
Court on 18/8/02 stating
that he was forced by the
Excise Inspector to become
a surety only nominally
promising to give him no
sort of trouble; that anti-
cipating the difficulties to
which he is now subjected,
he applied for the relief &
that he is not consequently
responsible for the amount
due from the licensee and
pray that the arrears may
be ordered to be recovered
from the licensee & others
concerned.

All his (Petti) properties, both
moveable, valued about Rs 126-8-
& immoveables valued at Rs
255/- were attached on 4/8/02
and the latter sold by public
auction on 23/10/02 for Rs. 180/-
& the former advertised for
sale on the 5th November 02.
On the 3/11/02 i.e. 2 days prior
to the date of sale of moveable

4

[illegible] petitioner the Sheristadar as well as the Amladar praying that their immovables offering to pay the assessed value —

As in the memorandum called for by the Court, further proceedings seem to have been held in abeyance.

The petitioner's Case seems to deserve some consideration.

Note and ask for the Peon's answer stating all the facts

[illegible] 18/2/03

Issued. No. 326 dy 11/2/03.

Note Continued

In reply to the above the Court states that, as [illegible] accepted the liability & made a statement

No 4877/228 dy 18/2/03

to this effect before the 5
Auildar, the Cond not
be relieved of his liability
to an extent of Rs 84-4/-
being the amount of 4
months rental.

Submitted to Secretary. H
3/3/03

RKM
2/3/03.

~~Date~~ Please put up a precis of the
Date Case about the Surety shd from the
file of Taluk & Papers, in order
of dates. Hrm
5/3

Submitted with a precis to Secy
H 12/3/03
6/3

RKM
11-3-03

~~Please~~ The Case is ~~not Quite~~ a doubtful
one
~~free from doubt~~. The procedure adopted to dispose of the farm after the lessee had committed default was not quite what the rules & the conditions of the lease allowed

Yes. The Revenue Board decided for cancellation of the mukta for the year Faesli 1312 under the rules H

6

The ~~Lessee~~ Petr agreed to become surety and ~~accepted~~ asked that he might be accepted — on 30 Sept 1901. The Dy Cr accepted the proposal on ~~5 Dec~~ 5 March — more than 5 months subsequently but he asked that a muchalka might be taken from the Petr. This was never done. On 10th March, the surety asked to be absolved. Before 5th March there were Counter proposals made by the Dy Cr & not accepted by the surety. I fear there is no ~~valid~~ binding Contract in the matter, and that Govt is not entitled to proceed against the petitioner at all

The matter is submitted for orders.

Hiss
16/8/3

The Dewan through the 2nd Counsellor

2 Share the Secretary's doubts. There was an offer but before it was

6x-8/6
16-3-03

accepted the Petitioner
seems to have withdrawn
from it - That being
so, and no Memorials
being forthcoming, it
is a question whether
the Petitioner could
legally be proceeded
against - This aspect
of the case does
not seem to have
been duly considered
either by the Dy
Comm or by the Lycia
Comm - Before
Report orders one
way or the other would
it not be advisable
to send the file to
the Govt Advocate with
an enquiry as to
his opinion? Apart-
from certain
irregularities of
procedure, the ques-
tion is whether
the statement made
by the Petitioner does
or does not with a
legal liability,
the subsequent cor-
respondence ~~before~~ not
withstanding - I

am anxious that our
position should be
made unassailable
as a matter of law.
H.
20/3/03

To be on the safe side
I would direct that
Clay of all further proceedings,
including the confirma-
-tion of the sale of
unmovable property H.
20/3/03

urgent

To the Dewan
Hon
20/3/3

9186
20.3.03

1758

I do not see that there
is any doubt that element
in this matter. Till all
events the foundation
when be agreed to be removed
- namely the Authorised Solicitor
Solicitor cannot accept the
money. His statements are more
than one person are absolute.
I do not know if a separate Mortgage
is required - Whatever Mr T.
Miller wants - I have no objection
to sell the Port Adv. Even when the
Dr Court asked him whether he was ready
money deposit be admitted his personal
liability

? Hon
22/3

Govt

Please put up a draft stating the case and asking for the opinion of the Govt Advocate. GL 23/3/03

A draft forwarding the entire record together with a clear statement of the facts of the case [redacted] calling for the Govt Advocate's opinion is submitted for approval

Sd/- Secretary 23/3/03

GL 23/3/03

to the 2nd Councillor -

3/4/3

GL 3/4

Ex. 95 3-4-03.

Write due reference, & think the Govt advocate may be consulted - The draft may be passed by the Secretariat - GL

3/4/03

Issue to Govt Advocate

4/4/3

Note continued

Rec 6/4/03

The draft was issued on 7/4/03. With reference to this the Govt. Advocate

10

It is clear that Ramaraccamma has actually accepted the liability & that he cannot withdraw his contract after it was accepted and that he is therefore of opinion that Ramaraccamma is liable.

Submitted for orders

21/4/03

20.4.03

22.4.03

To the Dewan
Thro' the 2nd Councillor

Ex 125
27-4-03
Court Duty

Under the circumstances the petition may be rejected. I hope he is right. The date noted by him seems to make some allowance for correspondence between the Govt Advocate & the Dy Court. 28-4-03

for other orders

(The complaint was communicated to the petitioner before the latter asked to be permitted to withdraw from his offer)

Draft put up.

30/4

To the Dewan

Copy 10118
5-5-03

Papers returned
7.V.03

Issued 4/5/03

For further addl

The Secretary has ordered in another case that doubts of this kind would be best set at rest by the Council
Call for report
records BV
29/8/02

Sep. Rev. 7 and 8 of 1902-03

1902-03 Sl 1

No. 501

Name of Petitioner Samia Veeranna patel

Village Parasiiramapura

Taluk Chellakere

District Chitaldrug

Date of Arzi 18.8.02

Date of Receipt 20.8.02

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure two

1) Two Rupee stamp appl.
(stamp sufficient)

2) order appealed against produced

3) In time

17.5.02

This is a council case
Sec cl b of the Schedule of excepted cases and S. 193 L
R. Code
Call for report & records from the Dy Comr
BV 29/9/02 BV 22/9/02

Recd 3/9.
for consideration put up
24/9. The qn of jurisdiction has been doubted in an analogous case.
Let this wait till the qn is disposed of there BV 24/9/02

Given back to the Peshkar 24/9/02

ABSTRACT

Appeal against the order of the Amildar (endt No 566) dated 25.6.02 as follows:- "Receive your petn dated 18.8.02 to the Dy Comr Tumkur, Hukum No 795 has been received 28.8.02 to inform you of the order already passed by him in the matter. Hukum No 636 already received 29.3.02 to the effect that you had stood surety to Sheemachi Gowri takkar could not be

MGCPB—4,000—31-1-02

be accepted and that you
should pay the arrears
due on failure of which
your property should be
proceeded against. ~~Hence~~
you are informed accordingly
and you should at once
pay Rs 511-4-0".

The petr submits that
Bheemiah was an independent Excise
contractor for 1901; that on
his default to pay the deposit
amount the Shop was put up
for Sale; that on the persuasion
of the Excise Supervisor
Challakere the petr agreed
to remain as Bheemiah's
Surety for only 2 months deposit
whereupon the Sale was stayed;
that as Bheemiah did not
comply with the conditions, the
petr applied to the Amildar to
be freed from the Surety ship; that
the Amildar thereupon called
upon Bheemiah to furnish fresh
Surety (vide notice produced)
that petr is now demanded Rs
511-4-0 after deducting what was
paid towards the 4 months deposit;
that petr was not a Surety for
4 months deposit but only for 2 months.

Pray that the amount be collected only from Bheemiah and th





(1)



By post registered
20.8.02 Do.
Two Rupee Stamps affd.

The Dewan of Mysore
Province.

2 enclosures

May it please your Excellency

I, the

501

under-signed applicant most respectfully & humbly beg to bring the following appeal for your honour's deep Consideration and kind disposal.

Bheemiah, the excise Shop-keeper was the independent Contractor for the year 1901. Owing to his default in the payment of the deposit-amount, the Shop was put up for resale in accordance with the existing rules, when, I had been to the Taluq Cutcherry on my own business. Then, the excise Supervisor of Chellakere Taluq, having sent for me, not only induced me to become a Surety to Bheemiah for 2 months deposit-amount but also assured me that he would himself look to the affairs Connected with the Shop And that I would not be made in any way responsible for the deposit Amount. I being a Simple old man Could not understand that the Excise Supervisor would entrap me

I was so much compelled that I could not but believe in the Supervisor. I became Surety for 2 months deposit Amount by which the Resale of the Shop was put an end to. Ever Since the Supervisor and his Subordinates managed the Shop affairs and I had not even the least interference in the management thereby.

AS Bheemiah, the Said Contractor And the Shop-Keeper did not Comply with the Conditions to which he was Subject, I, Anticipating that I would be entangled in difficulties Applied to the Dalqa Amildar to free me from the Surety-Ship. The Amildar was good enough to Call the Said Shop Keeper for a fresh Surety. Afterwards I was intimated through a Notice to furnish the balance Amount of (511 4 0) after deducting what was paid towards the 4 months deposit Amount

I was not Really a Surety for 4 months deposit Amount. It was only for 2 months deposit Amount that I Consented through the Supervisors Compulsion to become a Surety. On being demanded for the Amount I Applied to the Dalqa Amildar and the Deputy Commissioner that I Could not

Could not be held responsible for the Amount as I have previously given my Kyphiath before the Sulqn Amildar to free me from Surety-ship. Notwithstanding all this, the Amildar of Chellakere Sulqn has sent me an order dated the 25th June 1902 for the recovery of the Amount

All this I beg to State, has been done without any proper enquiry & I have herewith attached the notice and the order of the Amildar for your honor's Kind perusal.

I beg to appeal to your honor that I am a man of large family & have become greatly impoverished by the Common Unfavourable circumstances that have been brought about in these hard days

Under these circumstances I beg to appeal to Your honour to Send for the Original Record for your honour's kind perusal and to Send a final order to the Deputy Comrs So that the Amount may be recovered by the Contractor and Shop-Keeper Bheemiah and others, who managed the affairs.

For this act of kindness, I pray
for your honour's long life and
prosperity. I beg to remain
18.8.[illegible] Your most obedient
Chettiar: servant.

S.R. 14/02-03 Pet 566 Sl 2. (2) Chitaldrug 3-10-1902

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition No. 501 dated 18.8.02 received at the Dewan's Office from patel Sanna Veeranna of parvu-rampura Village, chellakere against the Dy. Comr's order directing that as the petnr was surety to Bheemaiah, Excise Shop-keeper ~~the amount of arrears viz Rs 5-11-4-0 should~~ he should pay the arrears viz Rs 5-11-4-0, on failure of which his property should be proceeded against.

is forwarded, together with its two enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Chitaldrug District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition.

2. The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

By order,

BV 29/9/02

for Secretary.

BANGALORE,
3/10/1902

Dfc

AB
24/9

There has been no date.

To Exhibit B for date

12/1/03

Ex 179
12-1-03

S.R. 1847/02-03

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
Regd. No. 7239
30 DEC. 1902
Pet 424

B

FROM

The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug Dist

To

The Secretary to the Govern-
ment of His Highness the
Maharaja of Mysore
General and Revenue
Department

Dated 27 December 1902.

Despatched 29

Received 30

General No. 99

No.

Enclosure No.

Submitting a report
on the prediction of Podail
Sami a Veeramunah of
Parasurampura Hill in pe
Challakere Taluk regard-
ing his quarrying to
Shop keeper Chemical de

Petn
30.12.0-
826.
Rep. put up
AS
9-1-03.
Subd
M
10-1-03

Deputy Commissioner's office,
Chitaldrug District.
Dated Chitaldrug,
21st December 1902.

No. 27 / 1 - En: 3-Files, Comments, record & opy
-inion & petition with 1 Boundaries.

From

M. Narain Rao Esquire,
Deputy Commissioner,
Chitaldrug District

To

H. V. Nanjundayya Esqre. M.A. M.L.
Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja
of Mysore, Revenue and
General Departments
Bangalore

Sir,

With reference to your official memorandum No. Rl- 566 dated 3rd October 1902, calling for a report with the entire records connected with the case, on the petition of Patel Sannaveeranna of Parasurampur village, appealing against my order directing him to pay the arrears of Rs 511-4- due by Shop-keeper Bheemia for whom the petitioner stood surety, I have the honor to state as follows.

2. On the 5th September 1901, the

the Amildar of Shellekere reported that 13 Bheemia, Toddy Contractor of Parasu-ramapura, Kowlur and Pagadalbhande farms for the year 1901-02, failed to pay the shop rent for the months of July and August 1901. Thereupon, an order was issued directing the resale of the said farms.

3. Accordingly, the farms were resold on the 30th September 1901, when the bids received being very low, the sale was not closed by the Amildar; but on the very day the defaulter Bheemiah produced Rs 211/ in cash before the Amildar, and prayed that he may be allowed, by substituting the personal security of petitioner Sanna Veeranna, to re withdraw Rs 422/ out of Rs 633, which he had at first deposited in the Savings Bank towards 3 months' deposit on account of the said farms. The object of the said Bheemia was that the sum of Rs 211/ produced in cash and Rs 422/ proposed to be withdrawn, i e, in all Rs 633/ should be used in adjusting the previous as well as the current years' arrears due by him.

4. Thereupon, the amildar sub-mitted the records on 2nd October 1901, duly obtaining a "Mutchalika" from Patil Sanna Veeranna for Suretyship, with

14 with his report No. 155 Soliciting orders for adjusting the arrears as proposed by the Contractor and for accepting personal Security.

5. After some correspondence Sanction was accorded on 5th March 1902 to accept the surety of Patel Veeranna for an amount equal to four months' rental, viz, Rs 844/ commencing from February to May 1902. Thereupon the said Sanna Veeranna represented to the Amildar that his liability as a surety to Bheemiah may be cancelled as the latter failed to carry out the terms of the agreement entered into with him. The Amildar reported this matter for orders and was informed that Sanna Veeranna could not be freed from his liability as a surety as desired by him.

6. On the 26th May 1902. the Amildar reported that only a sum of Rs 332-12- was recovered from the Contractor for the amount due for the 4 months covered by Sanna Veeranna's Suretyship and solicited orders to recover the balance of Rs 511-4- from the Surety in question. An order was then issued for recovering the arrears from Patel Sanna Veeranna by adopting coercive measures. It is against this order the petitioner, Patel Sanna Veeranna has

3

has appealed to Government. 15

7. The Vernacular records bearing on the Subject together with the petition and its enclosures are herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

[signature]

for Deputy Commissioner.

[illegible] & Subj

Sep. Rev 14 of 02-03 SS 4.V (6) 16

No 3216 Encl. one file
Ex. of V. papers
& petitions

dy 11/2/03.

To Vice Regie Comte
in Mysore

Has the honor
to forward herewith
Copy of letter no. 99
dy 21-23 dt. December 1902,
from the Dy. Com., Chitaldroog Dt,
together with its
enclosures & the
petitions in original
(to be obliged by return)
reporting on the
petitions of Sanna-
Veerappa of Param-
pagipura village,
Challakere Taluk,
Chitaldroog Dist, &
appealing against
the order of the
Deputy Comr of
Chitaldroog declining

To relieve him of
his liability, as
Secretary, to once in
Biennially, because
of Parliamentary,
& allow Teddy Bears
in the Challenge
Tank for the years
1901-02, and to
request the favor
of an early expression
of the Executive Council
of Union in the
matter.

B.C.

11/2/03

Forwarded.

Tolle
11/2-03

Ex 336



1/

From

P. R. Srinivasa Esq.
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

H. V. Ranjendiah Esq.
Secretary to Government
General & Revenue Department

Dated 18th February 1903

Despatched 23 —— do

Received

General No. 4877

No. 328

Enclosure No. 1 file

In reply to Secretary's docket-No. 326 dated 11-2-1903

Returns with his opinion

the file of papers relating to the appeal of Sanna Veeranna of Parusavarampura, Chellakere taluk, against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of Chitaldrug dt. declining to relieve him of his liability as surety to Bheemiah, licensee of certain toddy shops in Chellakere taluk for 1901-1902.

Exn
26.2.03

9

No: 4877 Env 1 file
328

Excise Commissioner's office
Bangalore, dated 18th February 1903
23

From

P. R. Purnaiya Esqr
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

H. V. Ranjundiah Esqr
Secretary to Government
General & Revenue Department

Sir,

In returning herewith the file of papers received with your docket No: 326/Ex, dated 11th instant, relating to the appeal of Sanna Veeranna of Paru. saramapura, Chellekere taluk, against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of Chitaldrug, declining to relieve him of his liability as surety to Bheemiah, licensee of certain toddy shops in the Chellekere taluk for the year 1901-1902, I have the honor to state that the said Bheemiah on 30th September 1901 petitioned the amildar of Chellakere, praying that out of his security deposit of Rs 633/- equal

to

to three months' Khist, Rs 422/- may be utilized towards the arrears due by him, the balance of Rs 211/- which is equal to one month's Khist being kept in the Treasury as security deposit for the year 1901-1902; and that Patél Launa Veeraunah of Parasurampura may be accepted as personal security for an amount equal to four months' Khist. On the same date he also gave a statement to the same effect before the Amildar. At the same time Launa Veeraunah made a deposition to the amildar, stating that he heard Bheemiah's statement read out; that he has become security for Bheemiah's current year's deposit, and it may be accepted; and that he will abide by the rules on the subject, now in force and which may hereafter come to force. As laid down in para 4 of the Government Notification No: 6981-Ex 346, dated 7th March 1901, personal security should be given for an amount equal to four months' rent, when a cash security equal to only one months' rent is

But he withdrew before it was accepted. Even apart from it was not a completed transaction

is accepted. Accordingly Patel Lanna Veeranna is liable for an amount equal to four months' rent, viz Rs 844/-. On the 28th October 1901, Lanna Veeranna has given a statement to the effect that as he has become only personal security to Bhimiah, he cannot produce cash equal to two months' rent, as ordered by the Deputy Commissioner. I am of opinion that Lanna Veeranna cannot be relieved of his liability to the extent of Rs 844/- for the year 1901-1902. He is certainly not liable for the previous years' arrears.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

M Monteath

Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

C.V.K.

Order for obligation
Sept 21
Re
DR
Ex ⊗ 7/4/03
Sec 6.

2o

The Court Assistant
Bangalore

In forwarding
herewith the enclosed
record received with
the Excise Circle's letter
no. 4877 dt 18/11/03,
328 dt 22/11/03,
together with a Statement of
~~for reference & favour~~
the facts of the case,
~~of reference with the~~
~~reply~~ in the matter
of Patel Sannaveeranna's
appeal against the
order of the Dy Comm,
Chitaldrug dtd,
declining to absolve
him from his liabi-
lities as the Surety
of Bheemiah, licensee

to be obliquely returned

22

Ref Face a reference from
L2 of Queen Todd's
Rules for 1901-02,
has the Umpire to
request that the
Coach. He then to
will be good enough
to favour the Coach
with one early
Selection of his
opinion as to
which Team the Rule-
much made by
Secretary each
Year so
with a legal lia-
bility notwithstanding
Queen Correspondence
~~and this Statement~~
& which Team he
~~Considered~~ can be legally
proceeded against.

B. C.,

Hon Sec

23/3/03. 23/3/03.

Ex 4318 17/4/03.



Ex 17"

Sep Rw 14/02 & 23

Office of the Government Advocate in Mysore.

Bangalore Dated 15" April 03.

9-8-7

Encumbrance

From.

The Government Advocate in Mysore. Bangalore.

To.

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore General & Revenue Departments Bangalore.

Sir,

In reply to your docket No 572 Dated 7" April 1903 I have the honor to state that in my opinion Potail Samaveeramma's liability cannot be absolved and he can be legally proceeded against. The Suretyship of Potail Veeramma was accepted on the 5" March/02 and he applied on the 10" idem to have his suretyship cancelled. His petition by mistake is Dated 10" Febr/02; but the Amildar has clearly stated on the petition itself 10" March/02, passed orders on that date

24

The said cheque was ordered on the 12th March and the correspondence also shows that he applied on the 10th March. The said Veerama cannot withdraw from his instant application was accepted. Moreover on the principle of Veerama's security Pandigar Bhaskar was permitted to withdraw 2 months deposit amount to pay up the arrears. The Amildar having permitted Veera has actually accepted the security after as Veerama was concerned. The Amildar reported the matter to the Deputy Commissioner & have his act ratified.

In these circumstances I am of opinion that Veerama is liable and cannot claim his security cancelled.

The file of papers and the reference is herewith returned

endorsement No
~~10~~ 588
No 588 Exd Kandy
Dt 14th May 1903.

With reference to his petition regd. No 501 of 18.8.02 appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr. Chitaldrug Dt., declining to relieve him of his liability as surety to one Bheemiah, licensee of Parasuramapura and two other toddy shops in the Challakere Tk for the year 1901-02, Patel Samaveeramma of Parasuramapura is informed that after careful consideration of

the case the Govt
do not see any
reason to interfere
with the action of
the Deputy Commr
in the matter.

By order

Secretary

No. 487 dt. 14/5/03 Rev. one file.
67
forwarded
Copy to the Excise Comr
in Mysore with
ref. to his letter No 4877/328 dt. 8th ult. Rejecting the request therein
B.C.

Secy

Tom 4/5/03

Office of the Dewan of Mysore
Dated Bangalore 14th May 1903.

Sep. Rev 14 of 02-03 & 2
Sl. 8

No. 588/E4.

Endorsement.

With reference to his petition registered number 501 dated 18th August 1902 appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug District, declining to relieve him of his liability as surety to one Bheemiah, licensee of Parasuramapura and two other toddy shops in the Challakere Taluk for the year 1901-02, Patel Samaveerama of Parasuramapura is informed that after careful consideration of the case the Government do not see

any reason to interfere with the action of the Deputy Commissioner in the matter.

By Order



for Secretary.